



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

nb

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,793	01/15/2004	Jordi Albornoz	ROC920030291US1	5432
46797 7590 04/19/2007 IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER PHAM, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT 2167	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			04/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/757,793	Applicant(s) ALBORNOZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael D. Pham	Art Unit 2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

1. Claims 1 - 29 have been examined.
2. Claims 1 - 29 are pending.
3. Claims 1 - 29 are rejected as detailed below.

Priority

4. No foreign or domestic priority claimed. Accordingly the application has been examined with an effective filing date of January 15, 2004.

Specification

5. Applicant's amendments to paragraphs [0054] and [0059] are acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 7051275 by Gupta et. al. (hereafter Gupta).

Claim 1:

**A method for applying annotations to multiple versions of a document, comprising:
providing an interface allowing a user to specify how an annotation created for one version
of a document should be applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document**

[Gupta, Col. 12 lines 5-6, An annotation can be created by a user of any of the client computers
15 of FIG. 1. Further disclosing Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are
particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 2:

**The method of claim 1, wherein a set of options presented to the user to specify how an
annotation should be applied to the subsequent versions depends, at least in part, on a type
of the document** [Col. 12 lines 15-16, Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying
information and user-selectable options 242 254.].

Claim 3:

**The method of claim 1, wherein a set of options presented to the user to specify how an
annotation should be applied to the subsequent versions depends, at least in part, on a role
of the user** [Col. 12 lines 15-16, Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying information
and user-selectable options 242 254.].

Claim 4:

**The method of claim 1, wherein the interface allows a user to specify whether the
annotation should apply to multiple versions of the document** [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can
specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are
not to be displayed.].

Claim 5:

Art Unit: 2167

The method of claim 1, wherein the interface allows a user to specify whether a different copy of the annotation should be created for subsequent versions of the document [Col. 12 lines 15-16, Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying information and user-selectable options 242 254.].

Claim 6:

The method of claim 1, wherein the interface allows the user to specify whether or not an authorized user must validate the annotation prior to applying it to a subsequent version of the document [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 7:

The method of claim 1, wherein the interface allows the user to specify that the annotation, when viewed from a subsequent version of the document, should be marked as unverified [Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.].

Claim 8:

The method of claim 1, further comprising:

detecting a change in the current version of the document resulting in the subsequent version of the document[Col. 9 lines 26-30, begin and end times for the annotation are provided by the user via interface 152 of FIG. 3, or alternatively can be automatically or implicitly derived using a variety of audio and video signal processing techniques, such as sentence detection in audio streams or video object tracking.]; and

applying the annotation to the subsequent version of the document, as specified by the user via the interface [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 9:

A method for managing annotations for multiple versions of documents, comprising:

selecting one or more annotation versioning policies dictating how annotations made for a current version of a document should be applied to a subsequent version of the document [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.]; and

allowing creators of annotations for a current version of a document to select one or more of the annotation versioning policies to dictate how the annotations should be applied to subsequent versions of the document[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 10:

The method of claim 9, wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that annotations made for a current version will not be applied to subsequent versions of the document[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 11:

The method of claim 9, wherein the one or more annotation versioning policies selected are applied at the document level, to all annotations created for a document[Col. 13 lines 34-36,

Art Unit: 2167

allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 12:

The method of claim 9, wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an annotation created for a current version of a document will be applied to subsequent versions of the document[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 13:

The method of claim 9, wherein at least one of the annotation versioning policies dictates that an authorized user must validate an annotation created for a current version of a document before the annotation is applied to subsequent versions of the document[Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.].

Claim 14:

A computer-readable medium containing a program for managing annotation for multiple versions of documents which, when executed by a processor performs operations comprising: providing an interface allowing a user to create an annotation for a current version of a document and to specify how the annotation should be applied to a subsequent version of a document [Gupta, Col. 12 lines 5-6, An annotation can be created by a user of any of the client computers 15 of FIG. 1. Further disclosing Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 15:

The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the interface allows the user to specify the annotation should not be applied to a subsequent version of the document [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 16:

The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the interface allows the user to specify different annotation records containing the annotation should be created for each subsequent version of the document [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 17:

The computer-readable medium of claim 14, wherein the interface allows the user to specify the annotation should be applied to a subsequent version of the document only if validated by an authorized user [Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 18:

A data processing system, comprising:

at least one application for manipulating a document[Col. 7 lines 65-67, Media server 11 selects a particular combination of a single audio stream and a single video stream to be the "base" version of the multimedia content.];

an annotation store for storing annotation records containing annotations for the document [Figure 1, element 10 annotation server.];

Art Unit: 2167

one or more interface screens, accessible from the at least one application, allowing a user to specify how an annotation created for one version of the document should be applied to subsequent versions of the document[Gupta, Col. 12 lines 5-6, An annotation can be created by a user of any of the client computers 15 of FIG. 1. Further disclosing Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 19:

The data processing system of claim 18, further comprising an executable component configured to:

detect changes resulting in a subsequent version of the document[Col. 9 lines 26-30, begin and end times for the annotation are provided by the user via interface 152 of FIG. 3, or alternatively can be automatically or implicitly derived using a variety of audio and video signal processing techniques, such as sentence detection in audio streams or video object tracking.]; and

apply the annotation to the subsequent version of the document in a manner specified by the user via the one or more interface screens[Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.].

Claim 20:

The data processing system of claim 19, wherein:

at least one of the interface screens allows the user to specify the annotation should be applied to subsequent versions of the document[Col. 9 lines 63-67, a user can specify that

Art Unit: 2167

annotations which are particularly old, e.g., created more than two weeks earlier, are not to be displayed.]; and

the executable component is configured to modify an annotation record containing the annotation to reflect changes in the subsequent version of the document[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 21:

The data processing system of claim 19, wherein the executable component is configured to modify an index in the annotation record indicating a corresponding annotated portion of the document [Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.].

Claim 22:

The data processing system of claim 19, wherein at least one of the interface screens allows the user to specify an authorized user must validate an annotation before applying it to a subsequent version of the document[Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.].

Claim 23:

The data processing system of claim 22, wherein the executable component is configured to notify the authorized user to request validation of the annotation upon detecting changes

Art Unit: 2167

resulting in a subsequent version of the document [Col. 9 lines 26-30, begin and end times for the annotation are provided by the user via interface 152 of FIG. 3, or alternatively can be automatically or implicitly derived using a variety of audio and video signal processing techniques, such as sentence detection in audio streams or video object tracking.].

Claim 24:

The data processing system of claim 23, wherein the executable component is further configured to:

receive input from the authorized user indicating a portion of the subsequent version of the document corresponding to the annotation[Col. 13 lines 21-24, this presentation allows, for example, the user to verify the portion of the media stream to which his or her annotation will correspond.]; and

modify, based on the input received from the authorized user, an annotation index in an annotation record containing the annotation[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 25:

A method for managing annotations for multiple versions of documents, comprising:

defining a set of available annotation policies, each dictating how an annotation created for one version of a document should be applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document[Gupta, Col. 12 lines 5-6, An annotation can be created by a user of any of the client computers 15 of FIG. 1. FIG. 7 illustrates an annotation toolbar in accordance with the invention. Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying information and user-selectable options 242- 254.]

providing an interface allowing a user to select one or more of the available annotation policies to be applied to the annotation [Col. 13 lines 25-30, Annotation set identifier 272 allows the user to identify a named set to which the new annotation will belong. This set can be a previously defined set, or a new set being created by the user. Selection of the particular set can be made from a drop-down menu activated by selection of a button 273, or alternatively can be directly input by the user]

Claim 26:

The method of claim 25, wherein defining a set of available annotation policies comprises associating one or more annotation policies for use with annotations made for a certain type of document [Col. 9 lines 56-58, annotations could be associated with (or "anchored" on) specific objects in the video content, or specific events in the audio content.].

Claim 27:

The method of claim 25, wherein the annotation policies provided to the user in the interface is determined, at least in part, on a credential of the user[Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Claim 28:

The method of claim 27, wherein the annotation policies provided to the user in the interface is determined, at least in part, on a type of document associated with the annotation [Col. 12 lines 15-16, Annotation toolbar 240 includes various identifying information and user-selectable options 242 254.].

Art Unit: 2167

Claim 29:

The method of claim 25, wherein defining a set of available annotation policies comprises defining the set of available annotation policies by an administrator, wherein the administrator and the user are different entities [Col. 13 lines 34-36, allowing the creator of the set to identify which users are able to read and/or write to the annotation set].

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 10/16/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's asserted the following (lettered):

A. That Gupta does not teach, show, or suggest a method or interface that allows a user to specify how an annotation created for one version of a document should be applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document, as recited in claims 1, 9, 14, 18, and 25. Stating that Gupta in fact discloses that users may not specify how an annotation created for one version of a document should be applied to subsequent versions of documents. Thereby concluding that a user is not given any choice of how an annotation created for one document should be applied to subsequent versions as claimed.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions. Claim 1 states "providing an interface allowing a user to specify how an annotation created for one version of a document should be applied to one or more subsequent versions of the document." Accordingly, Gupta discloses that an annotation can be created by a user of any of the client computers of fig.

1. The annotations are therefore available to users being presented with any of the versions of the multimedia content, even though only one copy of the annotation is maintained by the annotation server, col. 2 lines 56-59. Put in one way, because the user is able to create an annotation they are thereby specifying how the annotation created should be applied to subsequent versions.

Secondly, even if that interpretation is not what applicant had intended, Gupta still discloses another aspect of the limitation. More specifically, Gupta, col. 4 l. 29-32, discloses “when a user of a client computer desires to add or RETRIEVE annotations, the client computer contacts the annotation server to perform the desired addition/retrieval”. That is, the USER specifies what annotation previously created is to be provided to media. Accordingly, the claims as written are unpersuasive and are anticipated by the Gupta reference.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2167

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor

Cam Y Truong
Art Unit 2162
Primary Examiner

cy


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Application/Control Number: 10/757,793
Art Unit: 2167

Page 15